

9

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/767,460	01/28/2004	Richard M. Boren	42801.3.76.1	5779
	7590 10/12/2001 AL PROPERTY GROU	•	EXAMINER	
FREDRIKSON	& BYRON, P.A.		GORDON, BRIAN R	
200 SOUTH SI SUITE 4000	AIH SIKEEI		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55402	•	1797	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			10/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/767,460	BOREN ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Brian R. Gordon	1743			
The MAILING DATE of this communication ap Period for Reply	opears on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence address			
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPUBLICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING I. Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statu Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION .136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tire d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ARANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication.			
Status					
1)⊠ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06.	August 2007.				
_					
3) Since this application is in condition for allows					
closed in accordance with the practice under	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 4	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4) ⊠ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the applicatio 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-9 is/are withdraws 5) □ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ⊠ Claim(s) 10 and 12-17 is/are rejected. 7) ⊠ Claim(s) 11 is/are objected to. 8) □ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/	n from consideration.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examin 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ac Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corre 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	ccepted or b) objected to by the e drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Section is required if the drawing(s) is ob	e 37 CFR 1.85(a). jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreig a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documer 2. Certified copies of the priority documer 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	nts have been received. Its have been received in Application ority documents have been received au (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage			
Attachment(s) 1) ☑ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) ☐ Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	Paper No(s)/Mail Do 5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:	ate			

Application/Control Number: 10/767,460

Art Unit: 1743

DETAILED ACTION

Page 2

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statement filed February 13, 2006 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered. The references not initialed were either missing of not legible.

Election/Restrictions

2. Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on August 6, 2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that no serious burden exists for the examiner. This is not found persuasive because the inventions are distinct as illustrated by the difference in classification and both inventions would require different searches.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Art Unit: 1743

4. Claims 10 and 12-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pahlman et al., US 2004/0109800

The applied reference has a common inventor with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Pahlman et al. discloses system for removal of targeted pollutants, such as oxides of sulfur, oxides of nitrogen, mercury compounds and ash, from combustion and other industrial process gases and processes utilizing the system. Metal oxides, such as oxides of manganese, are utilized as the primary sorbent in the system for removal or capture of pollutants. The metal oxides are introduced from feeders into reaction zones of the system where they are contacted with a gas from which pollutants are to be removed. With respect to pollutant removal, the sorbent may interact with a pollutant as a catalyst, reactant, adsorbent or absorbent. Removal may occur in single-stage, dual-stage, or multi-stage systems with a variety of different configurations and reaction zones, e.g., bag house, cyclones, fluidized beds, and the like. Process parameters, particularly system differential pressure, are controlled by electronic controls to maintain minimal system differential pressure, and to monitor and adjust pollutant removal efficiencies. Reacted sorbent may be removed from the reaction action zones for

recycling or recycled or regenerated with useful and marketable by-products being recovered during regeneration (abstract).

The reference discloses a system that includes all of the structural limitations as claimed (see entire document) including a controller for controlling the conditions or parameters of aqueous systems are maintained within the metal oxide stability area for the target metal oxide valence state with regard to electrochemical (oxidizing) potential (Eh) range and pH range at the prescribed system temperature at ambient atmospheric conditions in order to provide an Eh-pH combination to achieve stable solution equilibrium, as defined by the stability area as delineated in, for example, a Pourbaix Window diagram, such as those depicted in FIGS. 31 and 32 (see paragraph 0186).

Allowable Subject Matter

- 5. Claim 11 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, 2nd paragraph, set forth in this Office action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
- 6. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The prior art does not disclose nor fairly suggest system comprising an electrolytic cell.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian R. Gordon whose telephone number is 571-272-1258. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 1st Fri. Off.

Application/Control Number: 10/767,460

Art Unit: 1743

Page 5

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jill Warden can be reached on 571-272-1267. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR ANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brian R Gordon Primary Examiner Art Unit 1743

brg

BRIAN R. GORDON PRIMARY EXAMINER